

Remarks

The following numbered paragraphs are provided to respond to the similarly numbered paragraphs in the Office Action (e.g., paragraph "1" below corresponds to paragraph 1 in the Office Action).

1-2. The Office Action rejected each of claims 1 through 24 as obvious over Dingari in view of Mitts. Applicant concedes each of claims 1, 16 and 20-23 given Applicant's current understanding of the teachings in the cited references. Nevertheless, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's assessment of claims 3 and 17. For this reason, Applicant has canceled each of claims 1 and 16 and has amended each of claims 3 and 17 to include the limitations of original claims 1 and 16. In addition, Applicant has amended several of the other claims that originally depended from claims 1 and 16 to now depend from currently pending claims.

With respect to claim 3, as explained in the present specification, when a report is to be delivered to a browser, in at least some applications, a program run by the browser will be required to access and obtain the report. Here, the first time the report is to be accessed, in at least some applications, the program may not have been preloaded onto the browser for accessing and obtaining the report and therefore, prior to obtaining the report, an instance of the program will have to be downloaded. To this end, claim 3 requires that the step of delivering a report construct to a browser include the steps of downloading a pulse sequencing program to a computer where the program is capable of downloading a report construct from a server and causing the program to retrieve a report construct.

As recognized by the Office Action, Dingari fails to teach or suggest the limitations of claim 3. With respect to Mitts' paragraph 43, that paragraph simply states that documents may be delivered in a specific and easily printable format such as Microsoft Word. Delivering a program in a printable format is completely different than downloading a program to a computer followed by using the program to retrieve a

record (e.g., a document). For this reason Applicant believes claim 3 and claims that depend there from are patentably distinct over the cited references and requests that the rejection of claim 3 and related claims be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 17, as explained in the present specification, often it will be desirable to transmit two or more reports to a single report recipient at the same time. For instance, a hospital administrator may want to have ten reports generated at the same time instead of piecemeal over the course of several days for several reasons. For example, by getting several reports at the same time the recipient is assured that the report information coincides with the same ending date. As another example, by getting reports at the same time, report review can be done at one time and, generally, administrative time to review reports can be reduced. To this end, claim 17 requires that the step of generating at least two reports and combining the two reports into a single record construct and transmitting the report construct.

With respect to Dingari's col. 4, lines 20-23, that citation teaches that a single report can include information from multiple sources. The col. 5, lines 15-20 citation teaches that reports can be sent as scheduled by a system user. Neither of these two teachings is akin to cobbling two reports together into a single report construct and then transmitting the report construct as a single information packet. While Dingari may contemplate that two reports or documents could be sent separately but temporally proximate or that one report could include information from two sources, such teachings are not the same as taking two separate reports and transmitting them together as part of a single report construct.

For the reasons above Applicant believes that claim 17 and claims that depend there from are patentably distinct over the cited references and requests that the rejection of claim 17 be withdrawn.

Applicant has introduced no new matter in making the above amendments and antecedent basis exists in the specification and claims as originally filed for each amendment. In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant believes claims


Arvind Taranath
Serial No.: 09/854,050
Response to Office Action
Page 9

2-15, 17-19 and 24 of the present application recite patentable subject matter and allowance of the same is requested. No fee in addition to the fees already authorized in this and accompanying documentation is believed to be required to enter this amendment, however, if an additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account No. 070845 in the amount of the fee.

Respectfully submitted,

ARVIND TARANATH

Date: 6-14-05

By: 
Michael A. Jaskolski
Reg. No. 37,551
Attorney for Applicant
QUARLES & BRADY, LLP
411 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI. 53202-4497
(414) 277-5711